

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-16, 18-20, 22, 27, and 29-32 are pending. A Final Office Action mailed March 13, 2003 objected to Claims 5, 12, 21, and 28, rejected Claims 1, 5, 10, 12, 28, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, rejected Claims 1, 4-6, 11-13, 16-18, 24, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and rejected Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. By way of this Preliminary Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 11, 13, and 24. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.115, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application.

OBJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

The Final Office Action objected to Claims 5, 12, 21, and 28. Applicants cancelled Claims 5, 12, 21, and 28 in the Response to Office Action sent December 23, 2002, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 5, 10, 12, 17, 28, and 33 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants cancelled Claims 5, 10, 12, 17, 28, and 33 in the Response to Office Action sent December 23, 2002. Also in that previous Response to Office Action Applicants amended Claim 1 to remove the term "front end". Therefore, this rejection is also moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 BY HUGHES ET AL.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4-6, 11-13, 16-18, 24, and 27-29 as being anticipated by Hughes et al. The Office Action states that the user's voice input is received at the voice activity detector within the digital trunk processor. The digital trunk processor is a system that supports a telephonic interface to a plurality of telephone users.

With regards to amended independent Claims 1, 11, 13, and 24, Applicants submit that the voice that is received at the user system is not received directly from a user, but is received



25315
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

from a user over a telephone network. The system taught by Hughes et al. is specifically designed for handling multiple incoming telephone calls (FIGURE 1). Therefore, Hughes et al. fail to teach or suggest performing processing at a user system prior to transmission to a remote server. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 1, 11, 13, and 24 are allowable over Hughes et al. Because Claims 4, 7, 16, 18, 27, and 28 depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 13, and 24, they are allowable for the same reason that makes their independent claims allowable.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 BY JACOBS ET AL.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 24, and 33 as being anticipated by Jacobs et al. The Office Action states that Jacobs et al. receive user voice input at a user system, processes the received user voice input at the user system based on two or more of noise cancellation, echo-cancellation or end-pointing, and sends the processed user voice to a server over a network. With respect to the amended independent claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that Jacobs et al. discloses extraction of features and transmission of the extracted features (col. 9, lines 7-20). Jacobs et al. disclose a feature extraction element 22 that extracts relevant characteristics of the input speech (col. 5, lines 29-32). Applicants submit that Jacobs et al. do not process the received user voice input so that it can be outputtable directly through a speaker. In other words the processed voice that is generated by the user system is in the same format as the received voice and thus can be easily outputted to an output device. Applicants submit that Jacobs et al. do not send processed voice that is in the same format as the received voice but sends the extracted voice features to the server. Therefore, Applicants submit that Jacobs et al. fails to teach or suggest processing the inputted voice so that it is still in the same format and can be outputted directly through a speaker. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 1, 11, 13, and 24 are allowable over Jacobs



25315

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

et al. Applicants submit that Claims 10 and 33 were cancelled in a previous amendment, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER JACOBS ET AL. IN VIEW OF REED ET AL.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 3, 15, and 26 as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al. and further in view of Reed et al. Applicants submit that Reed et al. fail to overcome the deficiencies of Jacobs et al. as noted above. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 3, 15, and 26 are allowable over the cited references.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER JACOBS ET AL. IN VIEW OF KENNEDY, III ET AL.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 7-9 and 30-32 as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al. in view of Kennedy, III et al. Applicants submit that Kennedy, III et al. fail to overcome the deficiencies to Jacobs et al. as noted above. Therefore, Claims 7-9 and 30-32 are allowable over the cited references.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER MOORE ET AL. IN VIEW OF GUPTA ET AL.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-14, 16-25, 27-29, and 33 as being unpatentable over Moore et al. in view of Gupta et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that Moore et al. is similar to Jacobs et al. in that Moore et al. is also performing feature extraction and sending the extracted features to the server (FIGURE 4). Moore et al. disclose an initial feature analysis step 63 of the digitized speech signals carried out in the DSP 7 (col. 6, lines 28-52). Typical algorithms which may be employed at this stage are linear predictive coding or filter bank analysis. The output of the initial feature analysis includes a stream of parameter coefficients. Applicants submit that these parameter coefficients are the extracted features of the inputted voice signal and are not voice itself. Therefore, Applicants submit that Moore et al. also fail to teach or suggest processing the received user voice input at the user system so that it is still in the same format as the received voice input and thus is capable



25315

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

of being outputted over a speaker or output device. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 11, 13, and 24 are allowable over the cited references. Because Claims 2, 4, 6, 14, 16, 18-20, 24, 25, 27, and 29 depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 13, and 24, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 103 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER MOORE ET AL. IN VIEW OF GUPTA ET AL. AND REED ET AL.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 3, 15, and 26 as being unpatentable over Moore et al. in view of Gupta et al. and further in view of Reed et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that Reed et al. fail to overcome the deficiencies of Moore et al. and Gupta et al. Therefore, Claims 3, 15, and 26 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the examiner has any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}




Michael S. Smith
Registration No. 39,563
Direct Dial: 206.749.9888

MAIL CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this communication is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via first class mail under 37 C.F.R. § 1.08 on the date indicated below addressed to: MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

6/11/03

Date of Deposit


Michelle J. Carman

25315

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

- 9 -

INTL-I-1007ROA2

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

816 Second Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301